

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Feature/Characteristic | Stakeholder Involvement | Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination | More Info. Loops | Decision Making | EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives | Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking |

**Project XL Process Reengineering
Stakeholder Meeting #2
May 20, 1998**

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Feature/Characteristic | Stakeholder Involvement | Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination | More Info. Loops | Decision Making | EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives | Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| More Information Loops | | | | | | |
| 1- What is the minimum/complete set of data needed to illustrate value of the project? | | | — | — | | |
| 2- Info loops often originate because of need to protect turf and individual program responsibilities. | | | | | | |
| 3- Loops cause difficulty in accountability for decision-makers especially multimedia. | | | | | | |
| 4- Cultural issues such as concerns about budget, staffing etc. create loops. | | | | | | |
| 5- What's in it for the regions/states? | | | | | | |
| 6- Meeting attendance etc. burdens stakeholders. Is there assistance for participation? | | | | | | |
| 7- Reluctancy of staff hinders coordination and increase loops because XL seen as external. | | | | | | |
| 8- Staff see XL as a deviation from rules and regulations which define and support programs. This causes staff to become leery. | | | | | | |

| Feature/Characteristic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | Stakeholder Involvement | Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination | More Info. Loops | Decision Making | EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives | Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 9- There is a perception on part of industry that statutes (litigation, decrees etc.) are obstacles. How will industry actions affect legal statutes/decisions in progress? | | | | | | |
| 10- Massachusetts is streamlining and eliminating regulatory process?? Questioning assumptions which is very effective. | | | | | | |
| 11- Successful technique was to separate the staff from the issues | | | | | | |
| 12- How do we define success? (E.g. community involvement) Who defines success? | | | | | | |
| 13- Must be a system in place to monitor and evaluate success? | | | | | | |
| 14- Some offices promote staff that have demonstrated success. | | | | | | |
| 15- “ XL means an exception to the rule” attitude serves as a barrier. | | | | | | |
| 16- Lack of accountability also a barrier. | | | | | | |
| 17- Ensuring that a good product means success | | | | | | |
| 18- Goal is to keep flexibility in XL but to put some structure into it. | | | | | | |
| 19- Program offices may not get info up front. This causes questions later. | | | | | | |
| 20- Sponsors may still be creative as long as the rules are clear. | | | | | | |
| 21- What is a product? EPA should expand the definition of | | | | | | |

| Feature/Characteristic | 1 Stakeholder Involvement | 2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination | 3 More Info. Loops | 4 Decision Making | 5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives | 6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| “product”. | | | | | | |
| 22- Cost benefit analysis should be considered in determining success. | | | | | | |
| 23- the exercise of going thru the process may be one of the benefits. | | | | | | |
| 24- EPA is confronted with diametrically opposed notion that process must remain flexible versus completely structured. Process should be structured in a way which expedites decision-making, solutions, and FPA Development . | | | | | | |
| <u>Federal/state Coordination</u> | | | | | | |
| 1- Process could benefit from full time XL champions who set meetings, comp. On time, move | | | | | | |
| 2- Staff turnover hinders coordination. Continuity is enhanced by responsible passing of baton. | | | | | | |
| 3- In drafting FPA, One person should be responsible for handling comments, coordination etc. | | | | | | |
| 4- For the Kick-off Meeting there should be a manual stating groundrules and structure. | | | | | | |
| 5- There should be a champion at political level to serve the cross program decision-making role. | | | | | | |
| 6- Internal review process for EPA should be limited and expedited. “Get it out the door” | | | | | | |
| 7- EPA culture seeks 100% consensus- Projects should not be | | | | | | |

| Feature/Characteristic | 1 Stakeholder Involvement | 2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination | 3 More Info. Loops | 4 Decision Making | 5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives | 6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking |
|---|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| hindered because of lack of 100% consensus. | | | | | | |
| 8- High level support- There should be someone at political level charged with resolving conflicts and making decisions. | | | | | | |
| 9- Agency appropriate needed resources | | | | | | |
| 10- XL is not included as part of EPA position Descriptions which menas lack of mechanism for accountability | | | | | | |
| 11- There should be a schedule which tracks the process between EPA and the state but not at the expense of stakeholder involvement. | | | | | | |
| 12- There should be an agreement on a schedule for both state and EPA. We should define a model for schedules/tracking systems but avoid a guidance document. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 13- Model for state/federal coordination should include all participants ??? | | | | | | |
| 14- What is the stakeholder process? Does it need to be an obstacle? | | | | | | |
| 15- Should review the State of Oregon Healthcare model and other models for federal/state coordination. | | | | | | |
| 16- Establishment of timetables should not be done at the expense of quality. | | | | | | |
| 17- Ownership-Who is responsible for managing stakeholder | | | | | | |

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Feature/Characteristic | Stakeholder Involvement | Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination | More Info. Loops | Decision Making | EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives | Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| process. We should build into the process resources, knowledge of stakeholders to help steer process. | | | | | | |
| 18- There should be joint management for process across all interested & affected stakeholder groups. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 19- Is consensus an internal EPA or within the stakeholder process? | | | | | | |
| 20- Some regions have had minimal coordination problems with states. Regions are concerned that HQ and managers are not making decisions and moving the process along. | | | | | | |
| 21- OR or the program offices should have authority to make decisions. | | | | | | |
| 22- Regional staff participated more freely when they realized that accountability was no issue. | | | | | | |
| 23- Florida's DEP mirrors EPA- EPA and states should coordinate/communicate reviews to avoid different outcomes and save time and resources. In "should be" process we should identify a central coordinating point. | | | | | | |
| 24- Regions should work with HQ to iron out issues such as statutory barriers early in the process. EPA HQ | | | | | | |
| 25- The goal should be to "Do it once, do it together, and use a common work process". There should be an agreed upon map for a work process. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Feature/Characteristic | Stakeholder Involvement | Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination | More Info. Loops | Decision Making | EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives | Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| 26- XL torubles are largely internal. | | | | | | |
| 27- Many managers are not willing to stick to timeframes. If a program office misses a deadline then the process should continue without them. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 28- Some managers are willing to make decisions but issues may not reaxh these managers in a timely fashion. | | | | | | |
| 29- Team members should understand that as a tema member one is expected to deliver in a timely fashion. | | | | | | |
| <u>Stakeholder Involvement</u> | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1- Is stakeholder involvement industry driven versus agency driven? What are the implications of this? | | | | | | |
| 2- There is concern that direct vs broad participation dcreates “elit” stakeholder groups. | | | | | | |
| 3- Need to clarify how stakeholders are chosen. | | | | | | |
| 4- Industries confront a counterbalance by bringing in stakeholders early for concepts that do not develop into proposals. | | | | | | |
| 5- We need to identify incentives that would provide a baseline to measure success. | | | | | | |

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Feature/Characteristic | Stakeholder Involvement | Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination | More Info. Loops | Decision Making | EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives | Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| 6- Environmental Justice (EJ) concerns should be met without entire stakeholder group attempting to understand the legal and procedural issues related to (EJ). | | | | | | |
| 7- Must be a balanced and accountable technique for advancing all concerns. Good decision-making identifies measures for determining success. | | | | | | |
| 8- Cannot extract EJ concerns out of a stakeholder process. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 9- We should examine the stakes of the stakeholders involved in the process. | | | | | | |
| 10- The risk of early stakeholder involvement may be perceived vs. real. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 11- EJ should be an educational piece of this process. It will help determine if we are doing a good enough in involving all concerns. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 12- Companies must be willing to be diverse in techniques and approaches (e.g. coffee shop discussions etc). | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Feature/Characteristic | 1 Stakeholder Involvement | 2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination | 3 More Info. Loops | 4 Decision Making | 5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives | 6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking |
|--|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| 13- Companies need information to suggest techniques and new idea for stakeholder involvement (E.g. case studies, BMP's examples). | | | | | | |
| 14- What incentives beyond Superior environmental Performance. Is this a catalyst for strong stakeholder sponsor relation? | | | | | | |
| 15- Many publics must be served and conversations with stakeholders must begin early. | | | | | | |
| 16- Issues should be deferred to local stakeholder groups. National groups do not always understand the local issues. | | | | | | |
| 17- Regional agencies should apply concepts of environmental equity in the region and not expect local groups to carry out requirements. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 18- Non-traditional groups should be included in process may demonstrate different techniques which complement XL. | | | | | | |
| <u>Decision-making</u> | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1) Process should encourage a champion decision-maker for Regions and HQ | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 2) Stakeholders need one contact; this contact should have access | | | | | | |

| Feature/Characteristic | 1 Stakeholder Involvement | 2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination | 3 More Info. Loops | 4 Decision Making | 5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives | 6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| to decision-maker. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 3) Groundrules should be established (e.g. what is consensus;minority opinion) | | | | | | |
| 4) Decison loop needs to include Congress. | | | | | | |
| 5) Need incentives and rewards for staff working on XL. | | | | | | |
| 6) Must empower the EPA negotiator or be clear what authority they do have) | | | | | | |
| 7) Rummler-brach & RACI | | | | | | |
| 8) Decision process should be transparent and clearly spelled out | | | | | | |
| 9) Staff are often hesitant about raising issues. | | | | | | |
| 10) Enforcement trumpability. | | | | | | |
| 11) Stakeholders can ne employed to shine light on agency decision-making. | | | | | | |
| 12) Should be deference to stakeholders consensus on what to do. | | | | | | |
| 13) National environmental should be resources to local-avoid undercutting locals | | | | | | |
| 14) There should be a practical way to incorporate the input of all stakeholder groups | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Feature/Characteristic | 1 Stakeholder Involvement | 2 Process Transparency, Predictability, Coordination | 3 More Info. Loops | 4 Decision Making | 5 EPA Staff Roles Resources Incentives | 6 Time Frames, Scheduling, tracking |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 15) Better coordination among stakeholder groups (local, national, EJ) | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|